



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Still another assistant editor says: "I accept the offer of assistant editorship and will do at least what I can. I have been *aiming* at some of the items mentioned, already." Again, good! But "aiming" is not sufficient. FIRE! This writer confesses to some doubts about aiming or firing at Congressmen as "such people in public positions are bothered considerably by requests of various kinds." but "if to *assume* that I can make any suggestions that will have weight will help the peace cause in the smallest degree, I will venture wherever I see an opening." We shall have to take a whole new paragraph to deal adequately with that matter of the pestered Congressman! Here it is:

Remember two things: first, of course, that you are an assistant-editor-in-the-field of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* and are therefore entitled to assume practically anything you like about the weight that your words will carry (most editors and assistant editors of practically all publications assume, for instance, that the weight of their words will tilt the universe; it is part of being in the editorial business); second, that your Congressman lives to be pestered. Even if you are a woman, he is your representative in the place where the nation's laws are made and its policies determined. His business is to represent you. If he is not representing you, it is your business to see that he does so. If you are a man, or a woman in a suffrage State, you can do this once in awhile by voting for or against him. Whether you are a man or a woman you can do this any day and every day by letting him know briefly and concisely what your ideas are, and how many of your friends and his constituents have the same ideas. Pester him, gently but firmly. If you receive only a courteous reply and the laws of the country are not changed immediately, do not worry. Write him again next month,

giving him a little more information about your state of mind and that of your friends. 'Way off there in Washington, he may have forgotten that his folks back home want peace and want it hard. If you don't let him forget you, he will remember you. Any polite, brief, easy-to-read, "meaty" letter, stating just plainly what you have to tell him, will make an impression on him.

Entrench and let your first salvo be something like this:

The Hon. Jeremiah Jimkins,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.  
My dear Congressman Jimkins:

or

The Hon. Astaroth Smith,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.  
My dear Senator Smith:

The assistant editors who were armed and equipped on Friday, February 2, had a difficult task before them, but they rallied nobly and executed a doughty defense. In this issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* is excellent ammunition for further efforts. Consult, for instance, the editorial "Our View of the Case," and the small one entitled "What Are We Going to Do?" Read through the article on "Armed Neutrality," by Professor Hayes and see what effect it has on you. If we are driven into action, is not this the best sort of action which we can take, firm, justified, effectual, yet avoiding any implied, unqualified approval of the ends or means of the combatants in Europe? Think it over. If you believe or doubt this, write to your newspaper, your clergyman, and your Congressman or Senator about it, and write to us.

## BOOK REVIEWS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

**ALL BOOKS LISTED ON THIS PAGE MAY BE OBTAINED, POSTAGE PREPAID, UPON APPLICATION TO THE  
AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, COLORADO BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

**War, Peace and the Future.** By *Ellen Key*. Translated by *Hildegard Norberg*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 271 p. 1916. \$1.50.

This work is noteworthy especially for its distinction between patriotism and nationalism, and its picture of the part to be played by women in the struggle for world peace. It is nationalism that urges the supreme right of empire, that erects a national god to be evoked for the conquests of the chosen people, that fails to realize man's allegiance to humanity. Patriotism, in the author's use of the word, is none of these things. Patriotism places national righteousness above the rights of the nation, recognizes the God of all nations and all peoples, labors prayerfully and mightily for a nation which shall lead the world towards civility, honesty toward all, might through right. Nationalists are shown not to be patriots, but rather the contrary, since their will works eventually for the destruction of the best in their own country. The greater portion of the book is devoted to woman's part in peace attainment, and of this perhaps the keynote is this paragraph: "Woman—as the earth—has, after war, shown her power to renew what war has destroyed. And so they will this time. But will it be without reservation? Will not the hundreds of thousands of women have come to realize that it is their national duty to procure for themselves the right in their turn to control the destinies of themselves and their children?"

**Selected Articles on Non-Resistance.** Compiled by *Mary Prescott Parsons*. The Abridged Debaters' Handbook Series. The W. W. Wilson Co., White Plains, N. Y. 93 p. 1916. 35 cents.

This convenient little volume furnishes a mine of fact and opinion equally distributed to both sides of the question of non-resistance. It is prefaced by an exhaustive brief for both affirmative and negative taken from *The Independent*

for January 1, 1917. Following this is a valuable bibliography of books and magazine articles on the subject, with a list of organizations furnishing special pamphlets on one or the other side of the question. The main portion of the booklet is devoted to significant excerpts from articles and books written on non-resistance or resistance during the last few years. Interspersed are also valuable facts for the debater's consultation.

**The Hope of the Great Community.** By *Josiah Royce*. The Macmillan Company, New York. 136 p. 1916. \$1.00.

A semi-posthumous volume of six essays on the problems presented by the war, this book is of utmost interest to those intent upon an interpretation of the future that will constitute a definite advance of civilization and results in a greater degree of world amity than has yet been possible. Paramount at this particular time is the late Professor Royce's insistence, in his first essay ("The Duties of Americans in the Present War"), upon the principle that "men can reasonably define their rights only in terms of their duties". It is noteworthy that, in the further discussion of this country's "rights" from this angle of vision, and despite his own frank admission of un-neutrality as a result of the sinking of the *Lusitania* and of the *Ancona* and other similar incidents, Professor Royce wrote that "the hope of the community lies in trying to keep before us a vision of what the community of mankind may yet become despite this tragic calamity." This community he judges to be not a cosmic grouping of "men without a country," but "international by virtue of the ties which will bind its various nationalities together." More striking is his contention that from this community political disputes may be absent because, viewed in the light of history, "the political functions of such a community \* \* \* are ethically amongst the least important" and that the nations will rather be "loyally engrossed in much better business than fighting." For this